

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

APRIL 18, 1894.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Territories, presented the following

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR IN REFERENCE
TO SENATE BILL NO. 1302, FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SES-
SION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 31, 1894.

SIR: I am in receipt, by your reference, of Senate bill No. 1302, Fifty-third Congress, second session, "To establish the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes," with request for an expression of the views of the Department thereon.

In response thereto I have the honor to state that a bill (H. R. No. 7) similar in its position to the one above mentioned was referred to this Department for consideration, and was returned to the House Committee on the Public Lands on the 30th instant, with an adverse report, copy of which is herewith inclosed.

The objections therein set forth to the passage of H. R. bill No. 7 are equally applicable to Senate bill No. 1302, and indicate the views of the Department upon the latter.

Very respectfully,

HODE SMITH,
Secretary.

Hon. CHARLES J. FAULKNER,
Chairman Committee on Territories, U. S. Senate.

ESTIMATED AREAS IN YELLOWSTONE PARK AND TIMBER RESERVATION.

The following are the estimated areas:

	Square miles.
Present area of Yellowstone Park	3,344
Areas returned to the States	367
Leaving to the park	2,977
Area of timber reservation	1,840
Area added to the park	1,200
Southwest corner returned to the State	170
Area returned to the States	640
Area proposed for the park	4,177
Proposed enlargement of park	833
Area Idaho Strip	37
Area Montana Strip	149
Area Yellowstone triangle	181
Southern timber reserve	500
Area retained	339
Proposed eastern reserve	870

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK,
Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyo., October 30, 1893.

SIR: I return you herewith the bill "to establish the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park," H. R. 7, with my strongest disapproval. It is the old enemy known hereabouts as the "segregation bill." The boundaries of the park as now fixed, and including the timber reserve, are thoroughly satisfactory, and should not be interfered with in any way.

It is proposed by this bill—

- (1) To cut off all the park north of the Yellowstone, Lamar, and Soda Butte rivers.
- (2) To cut off a northeast corner down to $44^{\circ} 45'$ north latitude.
- (3) To cut off the southwest corner below the mouth of Lewis River.

Not one of the portions thus sought to be cut off is of the slightest use to any considerable number of people. It is claimed that the north part is needed as a right of way for a railroad to Cook City. The whole wealth of Cook would not pay *running expenses* on one train a year, and there is not the slightest chance of such a road ever being built.

The people of Livingston are the active boomers of this project, and the cause is obvious; they want to hold on to the trade of Cook, which is certain to slip away from them if transportation routes are opened in any other direction, as by the advancing "Burlington route."

In a word, these three cuts would each be squatted on by a crowd of poachers, trappers, and skin hunters. The north one would destroy the best (except one) winter range for elk; the northeast one would take the home of the mountain sheep; the southwest one would take the home of the few remaining moose, and encroach dangerously upon the summer range of the buffalo.

If any public good would be subserved I should not make strong opposition, but this bill is purely in the interest of private greed, and that, too, of not a very high order. I recommend that the bill receive your active, earnest opposition.

Yours very respectfully,

GEO. S. ANDERSON,

Captain Eighth Cavalry, Acting Superintendent Yellowstone National Park.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 30, 1894.

SIR: Your letter has been received, inclosing H. R. bill No. 7, "to establish the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park and for other purposes," and requesting the views of the Department thereon.

In response thereto I have the honor to state that the Yellowstone National Park, the metes and bounds of which are described in section 2474 Revised Statutes United States, has an area of about 2,289,920 acres, or 3,578 square miles, and the timber-land reserve established by proclamation of the President, dated March 30, 1891, which abuts the eastern and southern boundaries of the park, and is practically a part thereof, being governed by the regulations applicable to the Yellowstone National Park and under the supervision of the acting superintendent thereof, has an area of 1,388,160 acres, or 2,169 square miles.

The bill hereinbefore referred to proposes to segregate from the Yellowstone Park 398,080 acres, or 622 square miles, and from the timber-land reserve 792,960 acres, or 1,239 square miles, making a total reduction from the present reserve areas of 1,191,040 acres, or 1,861 square miles. The boundaries of the park and of the timber reserve, as fixed by the statute and the proclamation above referred to, are thoroughly satisfactory, and no good reason, administrative or otherwise, has been presented showing the necessity for a change thereof, such as is contemplated by H. R. bill No. 7.

The bill proposes to take from the west side of the park a narrow strip of land situated in Idaho, and a narrow strip on the north side situated in Montana, returning the land in those States to the public domain and confining the park within the limits of the State of Wyoming. It also proposes to cut off the extreme northeast corner of the park and make the North Fork of the Yellowstone, sometimes called the Lamar River, the natural boundary; also to reduce the timber reserve by restoring a part thereof to the public domain, and including a portion thereof within the park proper.

I am advised that of the portions sought to be cut off from the park, (1) north of the Yellowstone, Lamar, and Soda Butte rivers; (2) the northeast corner of the park down to $44^{\circ} 45'$ north latitude; (3) the southwest corner below the mouth of the Lewis River, not one is of the slightest use to any considerable number of people

Those sections would each be squatted upon by crowds of poachers, trappers, skin-hunters, and other undesirable characters, thereby augmenting the difficulties attending the enforcement of the regulations for the government of the park, which, even under existing conditions, are great. The taking away of the northern portion would destroy the best (except one) winter range for elk; the northeast would include the home of the mountain sheep, that of the southwest would also include the home of the few remaining moose, and encroach dangerously upon the summer range of the buffalo.

In addition to the foregoing objections, it may be stated generally that the passage of the bill in question would establish a bad precedent, and will only be the commencement of the turning of the entire reservation over to private interests, for if Congress diminishes these reservations, as is proposed by this bill, in the interest of those who desire to occupy that portion of the Territory carved out thereby, it can not consistently refuse to take off other portions for restoration to the public domain. Furthermore, there is no present need for the immediate use of any portion of the land desired to be taken from this park and reservation to satisfy the demands of the public, as there are thousands of acres of public lands unappropriated which are much better adapted for homestead purposes, timber product, and mining uses than that sought to be secured by the terms of this bill.

In this connection it is proper to add that bills similar in character to the one now under consideration have from time to time been submitted by Congress to the Department for its views, and have been uniformly returned with an expression of its disapproval.

I transmit herewith for your information a copy of a letter from the acting superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park, to whom the bill was referred for report, setting forth in detail his reasons for objecting to the passage of the bill, together with a copy of my annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893, in which the Yellowstone Park and its needs are fully discussed.

Very respectfully,

HODE SMITH,
Secretary.

Hon. THOMAS C. MCRAE,
Chairman Committee on the Public Lands, House of Representatives.

FOREST AND STREAM PUBLISHING COMPANY,
New York, April 2, 1894.

SIR: In accordance with your verbal request of March 28, I write to express to your honorable committee my views with regard to the changes in boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park and the adjacent forest reservation proposed to be made by bills S. 1302 and S. 1753, the last named, I presume, taking the place of the earlier bill.

Before giving my reasons for the views hereinafter expressed, I beg leave to say that they are based on an experience of the Yellowstone Park and adjacent country extending over many years. I first entered this park in the year 1875 and have revisited it many times since, having spent months at a time in explorations in and near it and traveled over it in all directions. I venture to believe, therefore, that I know more about it than most people, for I saw it first when it was a wilderness without roads, houses, or hotel accommodations, and have watched the changes which have taken place during the nineteen years that have elapsed since my first visit.

During the twenty-two years that have passed since Congress saw fit to set aside this tract of country as a "public park or pleasure ground for the benefit of the people," none of the many attempts made by corporations and private persons to secure exclusive control of any of the wonderful and interesting features of the park have been successful. Congress has steadfastly set its face against anything of the sort, believing, and very justly, that the park was for the benefit of the whole people, and that any encroachment by private interests would be a serious injustice to the public. If the precedent thus established shall be now violated it will be less difficult in the future for other encroachments to be made on the park. If one corner is cut off at this session of Congress, it will be an easy matter at a subsequent session for someone to advance as plausible reasons for the cutting off of another corner. The paring down process once begun may not cease until the park has been robbed of every feature that now makes it so valuable.

The park is something more than a mere place where spouting geysers and boiling springs may be seen. Such features, while interesting, curious, and attractive to a large number of people, are unimportant when compared with the reservation's value as a storage reservoir for waters flowing east and west through the Yellowstone and Snake rivers, and as a shelter for the fast diminishing herds of American wild animals. The destruction of the park would certainly be followed by a great

diminution in volume of the water carried by these streams and used by farmers for purposes of irrigation throughout all the agricultural and stock country tributary to these rivers. The valleys of the Yellowstone and Lamar rivers, which it is proposed now to make the boundary for the park on the northeast, are a great resort for game in winter; so, also, is much of the country to the north and east of these streams. All the antelope at present to be found in the park range in that country in winter, the deep snows driving them down to the flats of the Yellowstone and Gardner rivers. There are also two herds of mountain sheep and a few buffalo in the country proposed to be cut off. These, as well as large numbers of elk which range there, would all be exterminated by the change of boundary.

It is stated that the boundaries of the park would be better defined on the northeast by a river than as at present by an imaginary line, but this is not true. As the boundary exists to-day the northeast corner of the park is walled in on the north by a range of impassable mountains. No settlers can inhabit there and lawbreakers can not pass over this barrier to destroy the game and fire the forests, but if the segregation bill should be passed, there will be substituted for this natural barrier—now a silent, effective, and inexpensive protection on the northeast—only a narrow river which can be easily crossed. To prevent incursions from the north bank of the Yellowstone River, large bodies of troops would be required to constantly patrol the south bank. The difficulties of administration would thus be vastly increased. The danger to all that renders the park desirable would be made more imminent. Whether it was mere chance or the wisdom of those who framed the original bill setting aside the National Park, the fact certainly is that this most important corner of the park is protected by nature far better than it could have been protected by the efforts of man even if vast sums had been expended for the purpose of keeping out lawbreakers.

The country proposed to be cut off from the National Park by this act is, on account of its altitude, entirely valueless for purposes of agriculture, and whatever grazing there may be on it is needed for the wild game which Congress has protected for more than twenty years. Much of the region consists of steep mountain sides and forms a valuable and necessary part of the watershed of the Yellowstone River. It is high and well timbered and so is admirably adapted to hold snow, and by allowing it to melt gradually it tends to keep the river always full and to prevent periods of very low water. It is thus of the utmost importance in regulating the water supply of the Yellowstone River and of great benefit to agriculture in the lower valley of that stream. The cutting off of this corner would inevitably result in the deforesting of these mountains and in consequent injury to agricultural interests lower down the stream.

The bill proposes to cut off also a large area of the forest reservation established by Presidential proclamation in accordance with the terms of the act of March 3, 1891, and now a part of the park. This forest reservation, being under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, has by him been turned over to the superintendent of the Yellowstone Park for administration and control, and is thus practically—if not formally—part of the park. This region is a high, rough, timbered country, whose forests are of the utmost importance in protecting the heads of streams which empty into the Big Horn, a large river flowing through a territory where there is much agricultural land, but so arid that without irrigation no farming can be done. Congress should be slow to take any action that would interfere with the rights of the very large number of hard-working agriculturists who have built up for themselves homes along these streams.

I have satisfied myself by correspondence that the feeling in favor of this bill is confined to a small section of western Montana, only the mountain towns wishing to have the park cut down. On the other hand those Montana towns on the plains, such as Stillwater, Billings, Red Lodge, and others, are opposed to this bill, for they understand that the throwing open to settlement of the forest reservation and the northeast corner of the park will endanger their water supply, and without water they can not grow their crops nor sustain their herds. The newspapers of these plains towns reflect the strong sentiment which exists in their section, and are wholly opposed to the segregation of any portion of this reservation.

It is to be remembered that in the past almost all Government officials who have reported on the park have taken strong ground against the movement to segregate any part of it. This has been the attitude of all the Secretaries of the Interior, the superintendent of the park, and all the engineer officers in charge of it. It was the ground taken by the U. S. Geological Survey until within two years, since when there has been, it is understood, an absolute change of front, and at present the Director of the Survey recommends the passage of this bill. It should be said, however, that although he makes this recommendation he has never visited the region about which he writes.

I beg leave to recommend most strongly that no alteration whatever be made in the present boundaries of the park. Any change will inevitably result in extensive

destruction of forests, injury to the water supply, and in the slaughter of large numbers of wild animals which should be protected.

On the other hand, I beg leave to recommend with equal urgency the favorable reporting and speedy passage of a bill which shall establish some form of government for the national park. Laws should be enacted and officers appointed to enforce them; courts should be given jurisdiction; crimes and misdemeanors should be defined and penalties provided for them. As the region is like none other in the world, and as its value depends on the objects of nature, animate and inanimate, contained within its borders, the willful or careless injury to any of these natural objects, or their destruction, should be visited with very severe penalties. Congress has so long neglected this subject that lawless characters in the neighborhood of the park have become very bold and have committed depredations of the most serious character.

The forests, the mineral formations, and the game within the national park and forest reservation are public property, and any injury to this public property should be visited with penalties as severe as would apply to the destruction of domestic animals, or of manufactured products which are the property of the Government elsewhere. The recent slaughter of a large number of buffalo in the park has excited general condemnation, and I am constantly in receipt of letters from individuals and corporations urging the necessity of passing a suitable police bill.

I am convinced that your honorable committee appreciates the high importance of the subjects of this letter, and I respectfully beg you to take action in the matter.

Yours, respectfully,

GEO. BIRD GRINNELL.

Hon. CHAS. J. FAULKNER,

*Chairman Committee on Territories, U. S. Senate,
Washington, D. C.*

LOUISVILLE AND PORTLAND CANAL,
Louisville, Ky., March 31, 1894.

DEAR SIR: My only excuse for addressing you is the deep interest I take in certain measures now before the committee of which you are chairman, viz, those pertaining to the Yellowstone National Park. For two years I was stationed in the park (1891-'92) as local engineer officer, engaged in laying out and constructing tourist routes. I then became very much interested in that reservation and took considerable pains to study questions pertaining to its welfare. I became so thoroughly convinced that the long-sought segregation of a part of the park and the right of way for railroads through it were not only not demanded by any important interest, but would certainly be a disastrous blow at the existence of the park. Thus I have done all I could to prevent the success of such measures. I take the liberty of sending you two maps which will, perhaps, throw light on the subject. One is of the park alone and shows the principal game pasture. I prepared it in the winter of 1893.

The other is a part of a map of the Western country, which I prepared in Omaha when I was engineer officer to Gen. Crook in 1887. It shows the proposed boundaries as outlined in Senate bills 43, 1302, and 1753. I have marked these numbers so as to show to which boundary they each refer.

As to these three bills it will be seen that 1302 and 1753 are essentially the same, the latter directing that the boundary follow the watersheds, but taking in on the whole about the same territory. Of course the practical difficulty of tracing out and actually marking a watershed line, where opposite valleys interlace with and overlap each other, would be something enormous; otherwise there is not, in my opinion, much choice between these bills.

Senator Vest's bill appears to me to be in every way preferable from the point of view of the welfare of the park. By looking at the park map you will see that the proposed boundary in 1302 and 1753 cuts the greatest game pasture in two from one end to the other. With a railroad there and the grass burned off, and poachers all along the border, the game could not long survive. In a pamphlet which I inclose, and which I worked up in conjunction with Forest and Stream last winter, there is a full statement of the merits of the case. Recent developments confirm and emphasize all its arguments. The question really amounts to a handful of people about the park against the whole United States besides. I have never heard an individual support these measures unless directly or indirectly financially interested. I got so I could instantly tell from a man's conversation, when I was in the park, how he stood upon this question. If he owned property in Cooke, I knew he was a segregationist; if he favored the segregation scheme I knew he was financially interested in Cooke or in Livingston.

I hope these measures will be resisted. They could never succeed if the merits of the case were fully understood.

I would also ask your attention to House bill 5066, granting a right of way for the "Burlington" through the park. I have indicated on one map the proposed route as far as the Yellowstone River. For the rest of the way the company is given absolute carte blanche in selection of route. They are given a right of way 200 feet wide. What this would mean, anyone familiar with the park can readily see. It passes through the heart of the buffalo grazing ground; his choice of any or all of the geyser regions; and has thousands of acres of tinder waiting for its locomotive sparks. It would be, in every respect, a ruinous measure.

As I said, I am deeply interested in this subject, but I will not tax your time further. I hope you, as Senators Vest and Manderson have done before, will resist these insidious attacks on what is certainly a very important national domain. If Mr. Vest's bill could be passed it would, in my opinion, go very far toward giving the park that substantial protection which it so much needs.

Very truly, yours,

HIRAM M. CHITTENDEN,
First Lieutenant Engineers, U. S. Army.

Hon. CHARLES J. FAULKNER,
Chairman Committee on Territories, U. S. Senate, Washington.

U. S. ENGINEER OFFICE, LOUISVILLE AND PORTLAND CANAL,
Louisville, Ky., March 31, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Since writing my letter to you this morning I have perused more carefully Mr. Vest's bill, and am more than ever impressed with the fact that it is what the park wants. There is need of no further positive legislation in reference to that reservation than a law defining and directing the marking of the boundaries; defining offenses and fixing their penalties, and determining the legal jurisdiction of that territory; and, finally, some provision in reference to the roads. All these points are covered in bill 1753. It gives the best possible boundary and directs that it be marked. It provides for punishment of offenses in a way that would operate powerfully to prevent offenses like the recent deplorable slaughter of buffalo. What avails it to have an efficient superintendent, like the present, if he can not bring offenders to punishment?

Finally, it provides that the engineer officer in charge of roads shall actually reside in the park during the working season, instead of, as at present, a thousand miles away.

If this bill could become a law there would need no other legislation for many years to come.

Very truly, yours,

HIRAM M. CHITTENDEN.

Hon. CHAS. J. FAULKNER,
Chairman Committee on Territories, U. S. Senate.

603 LOUISIANA AVENUE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I notice from the papers that your committee was addressed yesterday by my friend, Mr. Hague, on the subject of the boundaries of Yellowstone Park. From long experience no one is more competent to inform you on the subject than he. While I do not pretend to have the same technical knowledge he possesses, I think repeated visits to the park and a long study of the subject qualifies me to assert my views, which in some material respect are adverse to those of Mr. Hague. For years we have been acting together in the matter, both in the interest of the protection and enlargement of the park. The serious difficulty has always confronted us of the antagonism of a railroad interest seeking ingress to the park. Every time the bill protecting and enlarging the park passed the Senate (and it passed it over some six times) the railroad interest has succeeded in having its scheme engrafted on our bill in the House Committee on the Public Lands, so that we have preferred to see the measure fail in the House rather than to endanger its passage with a railroad measure attached to it. Finally, Mr. Hague has become weary of the continued conflict and has persuaded himself that it is better to segregate the northern portion of the park, so as to make the boundary on that side the Yellowstone River. In so doing he would throw out of the park 150,000 acres. The greater part of this area has been pronounced by the engineer authorities to be generally heavy timbered, and from its exposure admirably adapted to catch and hold the snow. "It allows the snow to melt gradually during the summer, and so maintains the uniform flow in the streams and springs tributary to the Yellowstone, and

thus tends to secure a uniform discharge in the river itself. If this tract of land was taken from the park it would soon be stripped of its timber, the snow would melt quickly in the spring, would cause a sudden freshet, and a corresponding period of very low water."

I refer the committee to the testimony of Capt. Kingman, engineer in charge of the Yellowstone Park, who states various other reasons of an economical nature to show that the Yellowstone River should not be made to constitute the northern boundary of the park, and that the segregation now desired should not be made. (H. R. Report No. 1076, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, p. 249.)

Mr. Hague himself was asked this question: "How far, if at all, does a scheme for constructing a railroad to a mining point east of the park, called Cook, enter into the question made as to a change in the northern boundary of the park?" Answer: "The people who desire a railroad to Cook City wish to make the Yellowstone River the boundary of the park in order to follow up the north bank. This would make the north boundary of the park considerably south of the 45th parallel, and would leave a wedge-shaped area of Wyoming north of the park. The effect of this would be to throw open an extensive region of timbered country and a large area drained by the east fork of the Yellowstone, which, in my opinion, would be detrimental to the interests of the park and the Yellowstone River. A railroad, if really necessary, could be constructed to reach Cook City from Billings, on the Northern Pacific Railroad, without invading the park."

I think the reasons alleged by Mr. Hague still continue to hold good, and I am of opinion that it has been established, by surveys actually made on the ground, or at least the general courses of which have been run, that Cook City can be reached, as Mr. Hague himself said, without touching the park. This is the view which is shared by the editor of Forest and Stream, who has given more attention to the matter than anyone else, and who has concluded that the segregation of the northern portion of the park would be most detrimental to the reservation. I am aware that Mr. Hague and some others think the influence of the railroad so potent that some concession has to be made to it, and that it is better to yield up a portion of the park than to retain that portion within its boundaries and with a right of way. But I am not satisfied that if, as I believe, the concession would be a wrong one, anything would be gained by making it. On the contrary, I believe it would be the excuse for further aggressions and encroachments upon the park on the part of the many corporations already desirous of entering. I think, therefore, that sufficient interest and support will be found in Congress to preserve the park in its integrity. If, indeed, anything important enough to justify the sacrifice were gained, it might be a matter for deliberation; but as I understand it, the question now before your committee is simply one as to the boundaries of the park, and does not afford the much-needed protection provided for by the Vest bill, which so frequently has passed the Senate. That bill contained measures of police and jurisdiction so much needed, for it is astonishing that Congress has for so long neglected to provide any penalties for the most serious offenses committed in the park or to provide any jurisdiction to try offenders.

As I understand it, the bill now before you is the one favored by Senators Warren and Carey. I wish you to examine the map inclosed, which I will be pleased if you will return, and see what the measure really gives to the park and what it takes away. And first, as to the increase. The bill adds on a strip to the east and to the south. This area is what now constitutes the Yellowstone Park timber reserve, and is set apart by the proclamation of the President as a timber reserve under the authority of the act of March 3, 1891. The present boundaries of this timber reserve are marked on the map inclosed with black lines. I can not see, without some measure of protection, how anything particularly is gained by having the timber reserve included in the Yellowstone Park. If there were any protective measures proposed the accession to the park might be desirable for the purposes of administration, but as far as reservation is concerned the area is as much set apart now as it would be if included in the park. But the bill has a more particular object than that of adding the timber reserve to the Yellowstone Park; for, as you will see by the map, it is now proposed to cut in two the timber reserve, and while adding one-half of it to the park it throws open to settlement the other half and restores it to the public domain. This proposed change in the boundaries of the timber reserve is denoted on the map by the green lines. The reserve is cut in two in that extent of territory to the east of the park, and is almost divided on the south by throwing open a considerable area adjoining the Snake River and constituting the southwestern corner of the timber reserve. You will thus see that in substance nothing is gained and much lost. As far as the strip between the western park line and the boundary of Idaho is concerned all hands, I believe, are agreed that it should be given to Idaho, so as to make the western boundary of the park the same as the eastern boundary of Idaho.

We have already adverted to what is proposed to be taken away from the park on the north, and in addition to the objections under that head already presented, I would state that it is proposed to make the boundary line of Montana the same on the north as the boundary line of the park. This would recede a strip which the authorities of the park think most important to retain, in order that the settlements should not be brought any nearer to some of the most prominent and interesting features of the park. On this point I refer you to the earnest discussion in the current report of the superintendent of the park. In regard to the larger area north of the Yellowstone River, which it is proposed to segregate, it may be worthy of attention that it constitutes the most important if not the only wintering place for the great herds of elk now protected in the park, and should the segregation be made it would result in the large destruction of these animals, which the Government has done so much to protect. The northern segregation proposed is indicated on the map by the green line. I sincerely hope that the boundaries as proposed in the bill before your committee will not be adopted. I am opposed either to a railroad in the park or a cession of land within the park for railroad purposes, and think that the highest interests demand that the park should be preserved in its integrity, except as I have indicated.

Yours, truly,

W. HALLETT PHILLIPS.

Hon. CHARLES J. FAULKNER,

Chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories.

I cordially concur in these views of Mr. Phillips and will appear with him before your committee if you so desire.

Very respectfully,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.